

The availability of Distant Network stations to the consumer is a viable opportunity to provide potential critical emergency news information at the National level of the Emergency Broadcast, and Emergency Alert System.

I believe a minimum of 4 network areas (one for each time zone) plus local channels are the minimum necessity for the best protection this country could have to offer. The more areas allowed the better the redundancy of course.

After 9/11 we have to take a cold hard look at reality. In the possible event of numerous successful attacks ranging from chemical, biological or even small scale nuclear and possibly dirty bomb tactics. The current system might not be adequate to the people that may need it most.

Under the current system it is known that local network channels provide this critical information to their customers at the state and local level, I don't even deny that. But if these stations were disabled on a grand scale then the ones who need the most information quite possibly might have no way of receiving the critical information needed to them.

Let's say there is a natural disaster, a chemical, biological, or even (god forbid) a nuclear attack or attacks in this country. What if someone's local area has been extremely damaged or practically wiped out but left with numerous survivors in adjacent areas and possibly even at ground zero depending on the nature and severity of the attack.

There quite possibly could be nowhere for these survivors to turn in this time of crises. There currently is no redundancy in place at the national level of the Emergency Broadcast system. If a more redundant system were in place and if someone's local channels were disabled from disaster, they could then immediately tune to their "time zone" networks. If those networks were unavailable also, they would tune into the next available time zone, until they are finished searching. This allows them to not only possibly get much needed critical help, but also to actually gauge the severity of the emergency at hand. This is extremely critical and has been completely neglected by the current system in my opinion.

I understand completely that these distant networks might not be able to provide immediate service to these communities but the news information they possess is a lifeline in and of itself. Survivors could then at least know what possibly to do. Maybe it is to move to an area where they are receiving distant networks because it is safe. Maybe from the news information they receive they will know that it is safer to instead stay put because help is on the way.

If they're local services are wiped out. Then the local emergency lifeline is wiped out also. What are the odds? Sorry, I'm not a gambling man.

In fact the only reason I can think of to "NOT" provide Distant Network Services by Cable and/or Satellite to everyone is GREED.

I believe the networks have totally neglected their responsibility to this country, given to them a long time ago, and it has been nothing but greed driven.

Listen, I'm not going to tell you I have all the answers but the more I thought about it (and I've had plenty of time to do that) the more this made too much sense to me.

Thank you.